

Application No: 10/820,827
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3126

The rejection discusses claims 1, 2, 4-15, 19 and 20, from which claims 3 and 16-18 depend, respectively, in the final four lines on page 3, all of page 4, and all but the final four lines of page 5. Of the forty-five lines in this portion of the rejection pertaining to claims 1, 2, 4-15, 19 and 20, only sixteen lines of texts substantively discuss the disclosure of Anderson. The remaining twenty-nine lines discuss deficiencies in the disclosure of Anderson that are admitted by the Office Action with respect to the rejected claims, and attempting to justify the application of Anderson in rejecting those claims in spite of this multitude of correctly admitted deficiencies.

Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection should be reversed on this abstract basis alone. However, the substantive discussion of the disclosure of Anderson as applied to the subject matter recited in the rejected claims is also deficient for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 from which claims 2-9 depend, recites, "repeating steps b) and c) for all n available hierarchical levels until all highlighted objects corresponding to said primary object are identified and placed in said list." Similarly, claim 10, from which claims 11-18 depend, recites, "identifying all highlighted objects in a highlighted hierarchy." Also similarly, claim 19, from which claim 20 depends, recites, "identifying all highlighted objects corresponding to said original object in all hierarchical levels."

With respect to the other subject matter recited in independent claims 1, 10 and 19, the Office Action relies on disclosure in Figure 20 of Anderson. However, with respect to the subject matter from claims 1, 10 and 19 quoted above, the Office Action relies on a reference to "iteratively examining the contents" in column 28, lines 31-35 of Anderson. This reference to iteratively examining the contents pertains to protocol distribution arrays 602 in Figure 6. In

Application No: 10/820,827
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3126

contrast, Figure 20 clearly shows only one highlighted object. Accordingly, Anderson does not disclose teach or suggest a plurality of highlighted objects much less the treatment of the plurality of highlighted objects recited in the rejected claims.

For at least the foregoing reasons it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1-20 as allegedly being unpatentable over Anderson be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of record and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.


While we believe that the instant amendment places the application in condition for allowance, should the Examiner have any further comments or suggestions, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the correspondence attorney listed below at the telephone number listed below in order to expeditiously resolve any outstanding issues.

Application No: 10/820,827
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3126

In the event that the fees submitted prove to be insufficient in connection with the filing of this paper, please charge our Deposit Account Number 50-0578 and please credit any excess fees to such Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

Date: January 2, 2008


Mark R. Woodall
Registration No.: 43,286

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
1725 Duke Street, Suite 240
Alexandria, VA 22314
Phone: 703-519-9801
Fax: 703-519-9802